DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 332 426 EC 300 288

AUTHOR Vogelmann-Peper, Marcella
TITLE Establishing Behavioral and Assessment Criteria through the Use of a Behavioral Level System for Dealing with Self Contained EH Elementary School Children.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 66p.; For a related document, see EC 300 289. Ed.D. Practicum Report, Nova University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Practicum Papers (043) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Behavior Modification; Behavior Problems; *Classroom Techniques; Elementary Education; *Emotional Disturbances; Evaluation Criteria; Inservice Teacher Education; Intervention; Locus of Control; Mainstreaming; Parent Education; *Personal Autonomy; Special Classes; Student Behavior; *Student Evaluation; Student Needs

ABSTRACT

This practicum was designed to establish behavioral and assessment criteria for dealing with seriously emotionally disturbed elementary students enrolled in self-contained emotionally handicapped (EH) units. A primary goal was to provide out-of-field EH teachers with an objective tool for continuously assessing students' individual behavioral and affective needs and progress to ensure dynamic and individualized programming for all EH children. The second aim was to establish a behavioral program whereby students moved from external to internal means of controlling inappropriate and dysfunctional behavior. Inservice training sessions on behavioral techniques were provided for teachers and aides, and monthly parent-training sessions were conducted to assist parents in managing their child at home. A three-level system was implemented whereby students could move from most restrictive to least restrictive levels, leading to a return to the mainstream. Positive results were achieved. Teachers logged students' daily behavioral charts and conducted periodic evaluations of the data gathered. The EH students reduced their maladaptive behaviors in class, and more than 50% of the students moved from more restrictive to less restrictive levels. Time-out was substantially reduced and most children attended at least one mainstream class by the end of the 8-month program implementation period. Appendices contain a parent questionnaire concerning discipline, a parent survey form, and a rating sheet for student behavior. (25 references) (Author/JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED332426

Establishing Behavioral and Assesment Criteria Through the use of a Behavioral Level System for Dealing with Self Contained EH Elementary School Children

by

Marcella Vogelmann-Peper

Cluster 29

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Marcella Vogelmann-Peper
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A Practicum II Proposal presented to the Ed.D. Program in Early and Middle Childhood in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education

NOVA UNIVERSITY

1990

EC 300288

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

JAN 1 ? 19..

PRACTICUM APPROVAL SHEET

This practicum took place as described.

Verifier Jay Marshall

Jay Marshall
Supervisor of Student Services

Lee Educational Center
207 N. Lee Street
Leesburg, Fl. 32748

January 14, 1991

This practicum report was submitted by Marcella Vogelmann-Peper under the direction of the adviser listed below. It was submitted to the Ed. D. Program in Early and Middle Childhood and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education at Nova University.

Approved:

1/18/91
Date of Final Approval of Report

JoEllen Salce Rogers
JoEllen Salce Rogers, Ph. D.
Advisor

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

TABLE OF CONTENTS. ii

Chapter

I INTRODUCTION . . . . . .

Description of Work Setting and Community. . . . 1
Writer's Role. 5

II STUDY OF THE PROBLEM . . . . . .

Problem Description. 8
Problem Documentation. 12
Causative Analysis 13
Relationship of the Problem to the Literature. . 14

III ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES AND EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS. . . . . .

Goals and Expectations. 25
Behavioral Objectives 25
Measurement of Objectives 26

IV SOLUTION STRATEGY 30

Discussion and Evaluation of Solutions 30
Report of Action Taken 33

V CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, DISSEMINATION 40

Results 40
Conclusions 48
Recommendations 50
Dissemination 51

REFERENCES 52

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Appendices

A PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE 55

B PARENT SURVEY. 56

C RATING SHEET (LEVEL 1) 57

ABSTRACT

Establishing Behavioral and Assessment Criteria Through the Use of a Behavioral Level System for Dealing with Self Contained Emotionally Handicapped Elementary School Children. Vogelmann-Peper, Marcella, 1990: Practicum Report, Nova University, Ed.D. Program in Early and Middle Childhood. Descriptors: Behavior Disorder/Emotional Disturbance/ Classroom Techniques/Personality Assessment/Teacher Attitude/ Teacher Method/Negative Teacher Attitudes/Program Effectiveness/ Teacher Influence.

This practicum was designed to establish behavioral and assessment criteria for dealing with seriously emotionally disturbed elementary students enrolled in self contained EH units. A primary goal was to provide out-of-field EH teachers with an objective tool for continuously assessing students' individual behavioral and affective needs and progress to insure dynamic and individualized programming for all EH children. The second aim was to establish a behavioral program whereby students moved from external to internal means of controlling inappropriate and dysfunctional behavior.

The writer conducted a survey to determine satisfaction with local EH programs and the qualifications of teachers serving the units. Three classes taught by inexperienced EH teachers were targeted for this practicum. Prior to implementation, behavioral data was collected on all 20 EH students to determine behavioral goals and to obtain pre-intervention data. In-services on behavioral techniques were provided for teachers and aides and monthly parent-training sessions were conducted to assist parents in managing their child at home. A three Level system was implemented whereby students could move from the most restrictive (six targeted behaviors each rated on a two point scale) to the least restrictive (self monitoring with intrinsic rewards) to return to the mainstream.

Very positive results were achieved with this practicum. Untrained EH teachers carefully logged students' daily behavioral charts and conducted periodic evaluations of the data gathered. The EH students significantly reduced their maladaptive behaviors in class, and more than 50% of the students moved from the most restrictive Level 1 to a higher Level. Time-out, likewise, was substantially reduced and most children attended at least one mainstream class by the end of the eight months implementation period of this program.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Description of Work Setting and Community

The writer's work setting was located in five rural Central Florida communities where approximately 2,500 students were being served. Three out of the five public schools were elementary schools grades kindergarten through 5, and the remaining two schools housed middle and high school students. The socio-economic status of the student population was middle to lower middle class, with the racial distribution having been varied among the elementary schools. Since this practicum was implemented in only two elementary school buildings, demographic data will be limited to these target schools.

The two targeted schools were very similar in size, and both were undergoing rapid growth as the nearby city continued to expand into neighboring rural areas. Both

schools housed approximately 600 students with eight trailers added to each campus to accommodate the steady growth in student population. The influx of new students was constant, and although most children remained in their respective schools, approximately 25% of the new entrants moved to other schools within and out of the county.

School community 1 consisted of white blue collar families, and school community 2 was socio-economically and racially more diversified. The latter consisted of a 93% white middle to upper middle class population and 7% low low income black families. Both schools communities' single parent households weree consistent with those reported at the national level, and in most cases both parents of the student population were employed.

The faculty in School 1 consisted of 26 female and four male teachers ranging between 26 and 52 years in age. On the average, the teachers had 17 years of teaching experience and they expressed satisfaction with their work. Non teaching staff included a 44 year old male principal, a 32 year old female assistant principal, a 56 year old prep specialist, and a 47 year old guidance counselor.

The faculty in School 2 was quite similar and consisted of 28 female and three male teachers ranging between 24 and 56 years in age. The average number of years spent in the teaching profession was 16 years at School 2, and all teachers expressed satisfaction with their vocational choice. Non teaching staff consisted of a 35 year old female principal, a 37 year old male dean, a 32 year old female prep specialist and a 42 year old guidance counselor. In addition, these schools received about one and one half days of psychological services from this and another female school psychologist.

School 1 housed two resource rooms for students with varying exceptionalities (i.e. Specific Learning Disabilities, Emotional Handicap, and Physical Impairment), and two self contained units for Emotionally Handicapped (EH) children. The latter two units served as a catchment area for all elementary school aged EH children whose educational needs cauld not be appropriately met in their neighboring schools. The primary EH unit consisted initially of four white boys and two white girls, ranging between six and eight years in age. One of the female students moved out of the school district during the Christmas vacation. The second

EH unit began the school year with five white and one black boy, and one white girl. In late February and early May, two white males were staffed into the unit, and one white male student left the school district in February because of his father's change in jobs. The children's ages ranged between nine and 12 years.

School 2 contained one resource room for students with Specific Learning Disabilities, one self contained class for Educably Mentally Handicapped children, and one self contained unit for Emotionally Handicapped students. At the beginning of the school year, the EH unit consisted of five black and two white boys ranging between seven and 11 years in age. One black boy left the district in November, and one eight year old boy was added to the unit in early December. All EH classes had one teacher and one aide to serve the children.

Writer's Role:

As school psychologist for the past nine years, this writer has worked in both regular school facilities as well as in special education centers serving Florida and New York State students aged five to 21. While working in an Upstate New York school system for five years, approximately 50% of the work week was devoted to evaluating children referred for psychological services because of academic or behavioral difficulties. Some of these students were found to be eligible for special education programs and those who were not, frequently required the writer's continued service via consultation with the classroom teacher to modify behavior and learning strategies. Ten percent of the New York work load consisted of conducting in-service training programs and workshops for teachers and aides as well as supervising paraprofessionals hired for a district wide Primary Mental Health Program. Fifteen percent of the work week was spent on implementing and monitoring behavioral programs for difficult to manage students in a special education center, and 20% on conducting individual and group counseling with

handicapped children. The remaining responsibility consisted of working on a committee which made educational placement decisions for potentially handicapped students.

During the first year in Florida, this psychologist assisted in establishing an elementary school based unit for severely emotionally disturbed children, and once in place, operated as school psychologist and therapist for this unit. Children referred to the unit were assessed by this writer, and a close link between home and school (with compulsory parent involvement) was maintained by this writer. This included teaching parenting skills, implementing behavioral programs at home, and conducting family therapy sessions. For the past three years, this writer resumed the more traditional school psychology role in the same school district working in the setting described above.

At the target schools, approximately 65% of this writer's time was devoted to conducting psychological evaluations of potential gifted children and students referred for academic or behavioral difficulties. The

remainder of the time was spent consulting with teachers, parents, the principal and assistant principal, as well as staffing educationally handicapped and recently tested children. In-service training programs and workshops for teachers were also provided by this writer on a needs basis.

CHAPTER II

STUDY OF THE PROBLEM

Problem Description

Much ambiguity exists in the federal definition of emotional disturbance, and consequently the criterion for classifying children as Emotionally Handicapped (EH) is a source of much debate among the educational, psychological, and legal professions (Ostrander, Colegrove, and Schwartz, 1988). Federal law defines "serious emotional disturbance" as:

> (1) The term means a condition exhibiting one or more of the following characteristics over a long period of time and to a marked degree, which adversely affects educational performance: (a) an inability to learn which cannot be explained by intellectual, sensory, or health factors; (b) an inability to build

> or maintain satisfactory interpersonal relationships with peers and teacher; (c) inappropriate types of behavior or feelings under normal circumstances; (d) a general pervasive mood of unhappiness or depression; or (e) a tendency to develop physical symptoms or fears associated with personal or school problems. (ii) The term does not include children who are socially maladjusted, unless it is determined that they are seriously emotionally disturbed.

Based on this ambiguous definition, schools within states and across the nation vary both in terms of identifying and classifying disturbed children in the schools (Goh and Fuller, 1983; Ostrander, Colegrove and Schwartz, 1988; Sattler, 1983; and Tharinger, Laurent and Best, 1986). This variability directly impacts on the EH units in Schools 1 and 2 who frequently received EH transfer students from other counties and from other states, making educational and behavioral planning a complex and challenging task for the EH Teachers. Moreover, a survey conducted among the school district's psychologists reflected a similar disparity in identifying and classifying EH children. Each school psychologist

indicated uneasiness with his or her role in the EH identification process and this uneasiness was attributed to both the vagueness in federal guidelines for EH classification and to the lack of consistency in instruments used for identifying EH students in the county. Emotionally Handicapped children in the writer's county were thus a diverse group ranging between a high percentage of acting out and a low percentage of anxious, depressed, and withdrawn students.

In addition to uneasiness in identifying and classifying EH children, psychologists in the Central Florida school district expressed a deep concern about the lack of adequately trained EH teachers and the insufficiency in effective behavioral programs in the county's EH units. Inquiries made at School 1 and 2 revealed that none of the EH teachers were trained to teach Emotionally Handicapped children, and that the state-wide shortage in certified EH teachers necessitated the hiring of the EH staff for the 1989/90 school year. The EH teacher at School 2, for example, was returning to her teaching career after an 18 year leave from elementary education, and the teacher of the primary EH unit at School 1 was a substitute teacher (with a degree in psychology) prior to taking on her 1989/90 responsibility with the EH class. The second

special education teacher at School 1 was employed by HRS (with a degree in sociology) before assuming the responsibilities of an EH teacher last school year.

These uncertified EH teachers at Schools 1 and 2 were unable to receive much guidance and assistance for dealing with their Emotionally Handicapped children in their respective schools, as the administrators and teaching staff were unfamiliar with the unique behavioral and emotional needs of EH students. In addition, the county-wide EH content person who was liason between the office of exceptional student education and numereous special education units county-wide, did not have the time necessary to provide intensive training to the uncertified EH staff in Schools 1 and 2. This lack of resources forced the untrained EH teachers to rely on their own knowledge and experience which had resulted in subjective trial and error methods for dealing with the students at the two target schools.

The problem at Schools 1 and 2, thus was twofold: (a) Neither school had established criteria for dealing with its EH students in the self contained classroom setting; (b) none of the EH teachers in School 1 and 2 had consistent measures for evaluating the behavioral progress of its pupils.

Problem Documentation

1. A survey was conducted among the discrict's school psychologists in June, 1989 and all eight respondents to the survey indicated dissatisfaction with the lack of consistency in measures used for the identification of EH students. Moreover, all eight psychologists expressed serious concerns about the absence of effective and consistent behavioral criteria for dealing with EH children enrolled in the county's self contained EH units.

2. Interviews conducted with each of the principals in School 1 and 2 indicated that on the average two EH students were referred to the office per day because of the teachers' inability to deal with the children's behavior in class. Both principals noted that the teachers of the EH units would require a great deal of help in implementing effective behavioral strategies in their EH units.

3. Three 45 to 60 minute observations were made in each of the three EH units by this writer. During these observational periods approximately 25% of the teachers' time was devoted to the intended lessons and 75% of the time was spent on intervening in inappropriate and disruptive student behavior.

4. Since the beginning of the 1989/90 school year (i.e. within a three week time span), this writer had been contacted twice by the EH content person to help EH teachers in Schools 1 and 2 in setting up intervention strategies for their students.

Causative Analysis

Florida is currently experiencing a very serious shortage in certified EH teachers and the writer's county had been affected by this shortage for several years. In addition, the burn out rate among EH teachers in the county had been high, and experienced EH teaching staff typically sought class room positions within other exceptionalities as soon as they became availble. This forced administrators to be continually in search of qualified EH teachers whom they had to select from a pool of mostly uncertified and inexperienced job applicants.

Having thus filled the EH teaching positions with the most eligible, albeit inexperienced, job applicants these EH teachers were unable to receive the intensive training necessary for dealing with their difficult and diverse group of emotionally disturbed students. Regular education

teachers at Schools 1 and 2 were unable to provide assistance to the teachers of Emotionally Handicapped Classes, as the EH students required intervention techniques which were quite different from those used in regular classes. Principals, likewise, were unable to provide much assistance and relief for dealing with the EH students, and the county wide EH content person's many responsibilities prohibited her from devoting the time necessary for training the uncertified EH teachers in Schools 1 and 2. This lack of assistance forced the three teachers at the targeted schools to rely on trial and error methods for dealing with a diverse EH student population whose behaviors ranged between a high percentage of acting out to a low percentage of anxious, depressed, and withdrawn behaviors.

Relationship of the Problem to the Literature

In their study of 127 school psychologists practicing under three types of state criteria used in identifying children as seriously emotionally disturbed Ostrander, Colegrove and Schwartz (1988) found that considerable confusion exists in implementing the public law, particularly as it relates to the classification of children as seriously emotionally disturbed.

For example, Ostrander et al. found that among the 127 school psychologists surveyed, 27% reported "complete" adherence to their states' criteria of seriously emotionally disturbed. Thirty six percent of the respondents indicated "moderate to complete adherence, and 8% reported "not at all" to moderate adherence. Approximately 2% of the 127 school psychologists reported that they did "not at all" adhere to their states' criteria. This inconsistency appears to be the direct result of vague federal guidelines which allow for significant variability in the nature of those classified.

Knoff (1986) has pointed out that a classification system is useful only when those applying it agree on what is and what is not an instance of a particular class. Some authors within the field of psychology have suggested methods for increasing the likelihood that placement decisions will be based on sound psychological principles while also meeting the requisites of the public law (Ostrander et al., 1988). Others have attempted to provide more specific SED guidelines by examining PL 94-142 and applying it to the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual Disorders (DSM III). However, none of these attempts proved to be very productive at this time, and numerous authors have argued, for instance, against the DSM III approach (e.g. Lachar and LaCombe, 1983; Ostrander et al., 1988; Sattler, 1983; and

Stotsky, Browne, and Lister, 1987). Those arguing against the use of DSM III for identifying and classifying disturbed children in the schools point to the questionable reliability and validity of some DSM categories, especially those which are first evidenced in childhood and adolescence (e.g. Sattler, 1983; Stotsky et al., 1987; and Tharinger et al., 1986). Others note that the use of DSM III psychiatric diagnoses are of limited value in predicting change in educational placement (Stotsky et al., 1987).

Instruments currently in use for assessing emotionally handicapped children have also come under scrutiny, and a great deal of research has been conducted on the most commonly used measures for EH evaluations in the schools (e.g. Edelbrock, 1983; Goh and Fuller, 1983; Lackar and LaCombe, 1983; McDermott, 1983; Ritchie, 1985; and Wolf and Wenzl, 1982). These instruments range between projective techniques and clinical judgment to parent and teacher rating scales, and their use varies among individual school psychologists. Although projective tests continue to become more psychometrically sophisticated (Knoff, 1983), the type of instruments used for EH evaluations might also contribute to the variability in the EH population found in public and residential school settings, because of their differences in theoretical bases and foci on

personality and behavior dynamics.

Stotsky, Browne, and Lister (1987), in their study of 510 emotionally disturbed children placed in three different psycho-educational settings (i.e. private day schools, private residential schools, and special class in public schools) found that students placed in these three vastly differing psycho-educational settings did not constitute completely dinstinguishable groups requiring different clinical and educational services. Using such variables as behavioral disturbance, psychiatric diagnosis, intelligence, and academic achievement, Stotsky et al. found no continua from public school special class to private day school to residential school in their investigation. The writers concluded from their findings that many children were misplaced, given their therapeutically different settings, and Stotsky et al. pointed out that the public schools could successfully manage students with severe psycho-educational problems which previously were thought to be unmanageable within the mainstream of public education.

Federal guidelines for "least restrictive" and "appropriate" placement of exceptional students are inextricably related, and serve to ensure that handicapped students are as much with their nonhandicapped peers as their special educational needs

permit. The advantages of mainstreaming exceptional students are obvious, and include such factors as age and socially appropriate peer models. Moreover, Calhoun and Elliott (1977) found that emotionally handicapped students' self concept and academic achievement scores improved significantly when placed in regular classrooms. Comparing EH students who were waiting to be placed into EH classes to EH students who had received placement, Calhoun and Elliott found no differences in academic achievement and measures of self esteem during the first year. However, on subsequent years, EH students who had remained in regular classes significantly outscored their self contained peers on both these variables, indicating that the EH students in their study were able to function in the regular classroom setting without negative repercussions to their affective performance. In addition, it is interesting to note that the mainstreamed EH children under investigation had higher achievement scores (over at least a one year period) than did their self contained counterparts. This type of research needs to be replicated, as it might have some very important implications for both keeping EH youngsters in the mainstream and gradually returning self contained students to mainstream classes.

The objectives for self contained EH units are academic

and behavioral in nature, and their ultimate goals are to prepare the EH students for as much return to the mainstream as is possible. Behavioral changes are critical components of mainstream success for emotionally handicapped students, and a great deal of research has been published on behavioral intervention techniques for children diagnosed as being autistic, retarded, hyperactive or having attentional deficits with hyperactivity. Some of these interventions have also been successfully implemented in self contained EH units and in residential facilities for emotionally disturbed youngsters.

Walker, Hops and Fiegenbaum (1976) studied the differential effects of combinations of treatment variables in producing behavior change in emotionally handicapped elementary school children. A token reinforcement system was implemented whereby the children were able to earn points for appropriate social and academic behavior on the basis of a variable interval and fixed ratio schedule of reinforcement for the respective behaviors. Social reinforcement (approximately 30 praises per day for appropriate social and academic behavior) was added to the token reinforcement program, and ultimately cost contingency (loss of earned tokens contingent on the occurrence of specified deviant behavior) was introduced. Results of this study indicate that intervention procedures containing multiple

treatment variables which are applied simultaneously produce better effects than do components of such interventions applied one or two at a time.

The nature of effective reinforcers for emotionally handicapped children has been investigated by numerous researchers, and Buckalaw and Buckalaw (1983) contend that such traditional reinforcers as candy, free time, toys, games, and attention are not particularly meaningful to the EH child. Consequently, such reinforcers apparently are less effective in bringing about and maintaining behavioral changes than is typically assumed by EH teachers. Buckalaw and Buckalaw found popular video games and free time to be a powerful reward in classes for exceptional students with emotional handicaps. The effects of teacher versus student selection of reinforcers in a token economy with EH students was investigated by Karraker (1977). Results of this study indicate that self selected reinforcers produced a higher level of performance among the emotionally disturbed youngsters than did teacher selection of the reward.

Group dynamics, social skills training and parent involvement have also been addressed in EH related research. Poppeil, Hollinger, Loschi, and Crawford (1983) point out that

EH classes frequently develop their own "peer counter culture" in which the social structure and relationships operate to resist the educational program. Powerful pupils gain their power, for instance, through aggression and the use of fear tactics, forcing the teacher to spend time and energy intervening in crisis situations (Poppeil et al.). Class management in such instances is difficult and tends to be reactive (Poppeil et al.). A comprehensive sociometric approach is offered by Poppeil et al. whereby individual EH children can be identified with respect to their group position and group status which will assist the special education teacher in effective class management.

Parent training and parent involvement with their emotionally disturbed children's behavioral objectives in the classroom also have been proven to be effective in modifying EH children's behavior in school. Bloomfield and Goodman (1978) conducted both parent training sessions and used parents to reinforce appropriate social and academic behavior when a "Good Newsletter" was earned in school. Both these techniques were effective in improving the targeted children's academic performance and their classroom behavior. In addition, parents were found to view their children's special educational placement

more positively, they became more confident in their ability to help their children, and they assumed a more active role with their children than before the parent training sessions.

The absence of appropriate interpersonal skills among emotionally disturbed children is a frequent complaint heard from teachers and parents. This inability to relate positively with others further erodes the EH child's potential for positive experiences, and the development of prosocial behaviors has been explored in the seventies. Gamble and Strain (1979), for instance, studied the effects of dependent and interdependent group contingencies on socially appropriate behavior emitted by emotionally handicapped elementary school students. Results of this study found that both contingency methods were effective in eliciting a substantial increase in socially appropriate behaviors. Coon, Coon, and Green (1979) found that academic cooperation with both teachers and peers can be successfully shaped in EH children through the use of operant conditioning techniques. In this study, subjects who were already earning tokens for work completion were able to earn an additional token for each activity completed with a child who was not in their group. This method of reinforcement elicited cooperative academic interaction not only with other children, but also with the classroom teacher.

Cognitive-behavioral intervention techniques with emotionally disturbed children have also been explored in the past decade ranging from self instruction to self management techniques (e.g. Kendall and Finch, 1979; Shapiro and Klein, 1980; and Swanson, 1985). Some of these methods require such sequential teaching techniques as modeling, audible rehearsal, whispering the self instructions, and finally internalizing the instructions. Long (1984) has devised a cognitive approach which teaches self control and pro social behavior by using therapeutic signs and sayings in classrooms for emotionally handicapped children. No data with respect to the method's effectiveness is available at this time, and placing Long's approach under research's scrutiny may provide further suggestions for teachers of EH units.

In summary, a review of the literature indicates that emotionally disturbed children in the public schools are a heterogeneous group since school districts across counties and states vary in their interpretation and identification of the "seriously emotionally disturbed." Variability also exists among school districts in the actual placement of emotionally handicapped school children ranging from EH units housed in public schools (moderately restrictive) to residential treatment facilities (most restrictive). Research suggests that many

of the children placed in relatively more restrictive settings can be equally well served in the public schools. Moreover, research has shown that EH students who remain in the mainstream do better on measures of self esteem and achievement than their counterparts who have been placed in self contained units.

A fair amount of research has been conducted on techniques for modifying EH students' behaviors. Operant conditioning, cognitive-behavioral, and social learning techniques as well as parent training methods have proven effective in replacing the EH students' dysfunctional behavior patterns. These intervention techniques thus seem to hold great promise for many EH students' successful return to the mainstream.

CHAPTER III

ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES AND EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

Goals and Expectations

The general goal of this practicum was to establish behavioral and assessment criteria for dealing with seriously emotionally disturbed elementary students in the self contained EH units housed in Schools 1 and 2. It was expected that the established behavioral criteria would be effective in modifying each EH student's targeted behavior, that the EH pupils would increasingly assume responsibility for their own appropriate behavior, and that the assessment criteria would provide the EH teachers with an objective tool for continuously assessing their students' individual behavioral and affective needs and progress.

Specific Objectives

The following objectives were expected to be attained:

1. That all of the children in the EH class would reduce talking out; verbal and physical aggressiveness; non-compliance; socially inappropriate interactions with peers and

adults; out-of seat and off task behaviors; and refusal to do assigned work by at least 50%

2. That all students would increase responsibility for their own appropriate behavior by at least 50%.
3. That all students would increase regular class attendance by at least 50%.
4. That all EH teachers would utilize consistent measures for evaluating program effectiveness and student progress by daily scoring and recording each student's daily rating sheet and by daily recording the number of "Time Out" occurrences per student.
5. That seventy five percent of the EH students' parents would participate in reinforcing their children's targeted school behavior.
6. That all participants of the EH parent-training groups would increase their child management and parenting skills by 50%.

Measurement of Objectives

Prior to implementation, the following data was collected for the purpose of obtaining student specific behavioral criteria and for pre- and post intervention comparison:

1. Teacher interviews were conducted to determine the specific behaviors to be targeted for each student in the respective EH programs.
2. Baseline data was obtained from the E. students on both teacher-referred behaviors as well as the following:
   (a) Percentage of talking out; (b) percentage of verbal and physical aggressive acts; (c) percentage of non-compliance; (d) percentage of socially inappropriate interactions with peers and adults (e.g. clinging, immature speech and language, bizzare or unusual verbal or motor behavior directed towards others);(e) percentage of out-of seat and off task behaviors; (f) percentage of refusal to do assigned work.
3. For new within county entrants into the EH units, step 2 (above) was utilized. In addition, behavioral data obtained from the psychological report, the Personality Inventory for Children (PIC) and the Child Behavioral Profile also served as baseline data.
4. Baseline data on students' Personal Responsibility Rating. This consisted of the number of behavioral criteria targeted for each student during base line data collection.
5. Mainstream baseline data. This consisted of each student's number of hours spent in the mainstream prior

to program implementation.

6. Parent Questionnaire (Appendix A); baseline data.
7. Parent Survey (Appendix B); baseline data.

During and after the implementation period, the following data was collected to assess student progress and program effectiveness:

1. Numerical values (i.e. Good=2; Satisfactory=1; and Unsatisfactory=0) were assigned to each student's target behavior, and rated hourly on the Level 1, 2, or 3 daily rating sheet,(Appendix C). The daily totals were recorded and charted for weekly, monthly, and end of the year (post implementation) comparison.
2. Level 1 through 3 daily rating sheets were utilized as a measure of each student's ability to assume responsibility for his or her appropriate behavior. Level 1 (white sheet) consisted of all the behavioral criteria identified by the classroom teacher, baseline observational data, and data utilized from standardized checklists and the psychological report (new entrants only). Level 2 (pink sheet) consisted of a 25% reduction in behavioral criteria targeted in the Level 1 sheet. Level 3 (green sheet) consisted of a 25% reduction in behavioral criteria targeted in the Level 2 sheet. No sheet was contingent

on a 100% reduction in behavioral criteria targeted in the Level 3 sheet. Deletion of behavioral criteria was based on the student's obtaining 30% S ratings and 70% G ratings on a given behavioral criterion during one marking period.

3. Parent Questionnaire (Appendix A). This 10 item measure was re-administered at the completion of the implementation phase to compare parents' pre- and post parent-training proficiency in child management and parenting skills.
4. Parent Survey (Appendix B). This 10 item measure was re-administered at the completion of the implementation phase to compare parents' pre- and post parent-training involvement with their children's school and social activities.
5. Mean percentages of pre and post intervention student specific criteria were analyzed.
6. Post intervention Personal Responsibility Ratings, as reflected in the reduction of criteria listed in each student's rating sheet at the end of the year, was compared to the baseline data.
7. Pre and post intervention mainstream hours were compared.
8. Class means on the above criteria were calculated and reported in tables.

CHAPTER IV

SOLUTION STRATEGY

Discussion and Evaluation of Solutions

Many researchers have attempted to address the dysfunctional behavior patterns of seriously emotionally disturbed children, and intervention techniques range from instrumental conditioning, to cognitive approaches, to Adlerian based techniques. Instrumental conditioning, particularly with the use of token economies, has been very popular in the seventies, and this methodology gradually was supplemented with more cognitively oriented interventions. Both methods are effective in treating maladaptive behavior and both techniques can successfully be implemented in a classroom setting. For example, Walker, Hops, and Fiegenbaum (1976) found that disruptive

behavior can be significantly reduced among EH elementary school children when social reinforcement, token reinforcement, and cost contingency are combined. Meichenbaum and Burland (1979); Swanson (1985); and Shapiro and Klein (198), demonstrated that both disruptive and off task behaviors can be significantly reduced among emotionally disturbed students when they are taught such cognitive techniques as self instruction and self management. Pepper and Roberson (1983), combined Adlerian theory and behavioral principles in their approach to modifying disruptive classroom behavior. More specifically, Pepper and Roberson operationalized the Adlerian concept of encouragement (aimed at giving the student a sense of self respect and accomplishment) by selective timing of carefully chosen reinforcers and well designed prompts. A concrete example of this approach is to divide EH students' work material into many short tasks which are designed to provide the opportunity for positive reinforcement and/or encouragement from the teacher. This intervention, according to Pepper and Roberson, not only enhances the emotionally disturbed child's concentration span and enjoyment of the task, but it also raises the student's level of competency in the task and consequently her self esteem.

All of the above EH intervention techniques appear to be theoretically and methodologically sound and seem to hold promise for modifying maladaptive behavior. However, an exclusively operant conditioning approach tends to places the locus for behavioral control upon the reinforcer rather than on the child, and self instruction and self management techniques may be effective with some but not all emotionally disturbed children. Further research needs to be conducted on cognitive-behavioral techniques with seriously emotionally disturbed elementary school aged children, particularly children under eight years of age. The Adlerian-Behavioral technique proposed by Pepper and Roberson (1983) lends itself particularly well to the structuring of academic tasks for EH children, as many (because of low self esteem) fear failure and thus will not approach seemingly "difficult" work.

For the EH students in Schools 1 and 2, behavioral, cognitive, and sociometric techniques were utilized for the purpose of modifying maladaptive classroom behavior while increasing students' responsibility for their own appropriate behavior. An integral component of this intervention technique is the constant objective feedback of students' performance and program effectiveness which allows for the dynamic flow of programming for each student's individual

behavioral and emotional needs as he progresses through his various levels of behavioral achievement. Some components of this program were modifications of techniques utilized by Popeil, Hollinger, Loschi, and Crawford (1983) and by Long (1984). Other components were a novel combination of techniques rooted in operant conditioning, cognitive-behavioral theory, and social psychology. These methods were chosen, as they were developmentally more appropriate for the targeted children than some of the techniques presented in the EH literature. In addition, the methods offered more versatility than could be found in the journals, hence making it uniquely suited for the heterogenous targeted population in Schools 1 and 2 and its uncertified EH teaching staff.

Report of Action Taken

Prior to implementation of the EH program, the following steps were taken in early to mid October:

1. Teachers and aides of the EH units in Schools 1 and 2 received two in-service sessions from this writer on the following topics:
   (a) Principles of learning, with particular emphasis placed

on operant conditioning.

(b) The various components of the new EH program.

2. Psychology and education chair persons from the nearby college were contacted for student volunteers to work in the new EH program.
3. College students were trained in:
   (a) Operant conditioning theory and practice.
   (b) The components of the EH program and in dealing with the children in the respective EH classes.
4. Baseline behavioral data was collected (by means of observations, teacher recommendation, and information gleaned from the psychological evaluation) for the purpose of choosing target behaviors for each student's rating sheet and for pre and post intervention comparison.
5. Meetings were held with each of the three EH teachers to assist in establishing behavioral criteria to be targeted on the students' rating sheets. In all three classes, five general criteria (applicable to all the students in each class) and one student specific criterion was selected. In addition, two bonus points could be earned daily for teacher selected criteria (Appendix C).

Following steps one through five (above), the following program was implemented in the self contained EH units of Schools 1 and 2:

1. A behavioral Level system whereby EH students earned their way from Level 1 (most restrictive) to Level 2 (moderately restrictive) to Level 3 (least restrictive) and ultimately full time return to the mainstream. Level 1 consisted of all the targeted behaviors identified during program commencement or entry into the program. Each subsequent level consisted of fewer targeted behaviors (refer to Chapter III), reflecting the student's level of responsibility for her own appropriate behavior.
2. Ratings of the targeted behaviors on the Level sheets were conducted hourly and in the following manner:
   (a) Students were asked to verbally assign a 2 (Good); 1 (Satisfactory); or 0 (Unsatisfactory) to each of the targeted behavior listed on the Level sheet.
   (b) If a discrepancy existed between the adult's and the student's rating of a given target behavior, the adult discussed with the student the reasons why the particular rating was given (this discussion was for clarification, not for negotiation

or arguing for a more favorable rating).

(c) For simplicity, at each Level, each student had the same number of targeted behaviors, but the nature of each target behavior varied among the children and was child specific.

(d) Bonus points could be earned for predetermined behavioral criteria.

3. Reinforcers, contingent on the number of points earned on the Level 1 through 3 rating sheets, were as follows: Morning and afternoon free time to play popular video games; thirty minutes of outdoor activities; peer tutoring and assuming the role of "big sib" to younger students in the main stream setting (for students at Level 3 or higher); weekly rewards at home or school; monthly field trips.

4. Time outs (consisting of a three minute removal from the classroom activities) were given to students who violated posted classroom rules.

5. Teachers and aides daily recorded students' totals obtained on the various behavioral criteria; grand total achieved on the Level rating sheet; and the number of Time outs per student. Each student's behavioral accomplishment (specific targeted behavior and grand totals) were presented in bar graph form and visibly posted in

the room. Students plotted their new totals on Mondays.

6. Students' Level sheet were rated by mainstream teachers prior to EH students' return to the EH unit.
7. With adult assistance, students drew and printed signs depicting pro-social behavior and the use of self control [modified version of Long (1984) method].
8. In late November, the Popeil, Hollinger, Loschi, and Crawford (1983) sociometric approach to understanding interpersonal relationships was utilized. Results of this analysis were used to change the negative interactional patterns among the targeted children [e.g. a modified version of the Coon, Escandell, Coon and Green (1976) technique was used to foster academic cooperation during academic group activities].
9. Throughout the program implementation period, weekly affective group sessions were conducted during which such issues as anger, self worth, failure, success, conflict resolution and pro social skills were addressed with the EH students.
10. Eight monthly evening parent group sessions were conducted during which baby sitting services were provided to enhance attendance. The following objectives were set for the meetings:

(a) Motivate parents to participate in reinforcing their child for good newsletters sent home from the EH teacher.

(b) Motivate parents to take a greater interest in their child's academic and school activities.

(c) Teach child management techniques.

(e) Teach appropriate parenting skills.

(f) Establish a support group.

11. In June, post implementation data collection was undertaken by this writer. The initial intent was to use the college students for pre and post program intervention data collection. However, since the college students' spring semester ended six weeks before the public schools' closing, this writer was forced into assuming the responsibility for collecting the data herself. This clearly was not the preferred method. However, it was expected that if any pronounced discrepancy between the writer's observations and the children's actual behavior did exist, it would become apparent during the analysis of the children's daily rating sheets. No such discrepancy was found. It should also be noted that the writer was very well known to the EH children as she had spent a great time working with the students in their respective classroom setting throughout

the entire school year. Hence, it can be safely assumed that the observer's presence did not elicit a change in the children's typical behavior and the pre and post intervention data collected is a reliable sampling of the EH students' classroom behaviors.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND DISSEMINATION

Results

The general goals of this practicum were achieved. Behavioral and assessment criteria for dealing with seriously emotionally disturbed elementary students in the self contained EH units housed in Schools 1 and 2 were established. The three EH teachers effectively targeted and prioritized student behaviors in need of modification. Moreover, the teachers successfully implemented a behavioral program which provided them with continuous, objective feedback of their students' behavioral and affective needs and progress. The program generated data which permitted a high level of behavioral and affective individualization and allowed for programmatic changes to build upon the students'gradual self reliance for emitting socially accepted behaviors in the school setting.

All EH children reduced talking out; verbal and physical aggressiveness; socially inappropriate interactions with peers

and adults; out-of seat and off task behaviors; and refusal to do assigned work by more than 50% (Table 1). In addition, each student decreased his/her specifically targeted behavior (i.e. "idiosyncratic behavior") by at least 60%. Objective one of this practicum has thus been achieved.

Table 1

Percentage of Pre and Post Intervention Reduction of EH Behaviors

	EH 1	EH 2	EH 3
Talk Out	74	54	63
V.& Ph. Aggr.	67	56	67
Non Comp.	86	53	59
Inapp. Int.	66	54	64
Out of Seat	79	52	66
Off Task	77	53	69
Refu. to Work	84	61	72
Idiosync. Beh.	83	60	65

V.& Ph. Aggr: Verbal and Physical Aggression
Non Comp.: Non Compliance
Inapp. Int.: Inapprogriate Interaction w/Peers & Adults
Refu. to Work: Refusal to do Work
Idiosync. Beh.: Student Specific Behavioral Goals

N = 20
Interv. Pd. = 8 mos.

Objective two of this practicum, has not been met (i.e. all children did not increase responsibility for their appropriate classroom behavior). Results indicate that whereas

60% of the EH 1 students and 50% of the EH 3 students did progress beyond Level 1, only 44% of the children enrolled EH 2 assumed sufficient responsibility for their targeted behavior to move out of Level 1 (Table 2).

Table 2

Percentage of EH Students on Most to Least Restrictive Levels

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
EH 1	20	40	20
EH 2	56	33	11
EH 3	50	33	17

Level 1 Most Restrictive
Level 2 Moderately Restrictive
Level 3 Least Restrictive

Mean hours of regular class attendance has been substantially increased by all three EH units (Table 3).

Table 3

Mean Hours of EH Students' Daily Mainstreaming During an Eight Months Intervention Period

	EH 1	EH 2	EH 3
Pre Intervention	0	0	0
Post Intervention	2.2	1.2	1.6

None of the children in EH units 1 to 3 was mainstreamed prior to the implementation of this practicum. At the end of the school year every EH child participated in at least one

classroom period of regular education and three students were considered for full time trial mainstreaming at the beginning of the new school year. It should be noted that the criteria for regular classroom selection were based on each student's strengths (e.g. academic, behavioral, and emotional) and the mainstream teacher's flexibility and willingness to work with an exceptional child. Regular education teachers, on the whole, reported satisfaction with the EH students' behaviors and the mainstreamed students virtually always received G or S ratings on the behavioral criteria while attending regular classes. It is also important to note that behavior, rather than academic achievement and work completion, was initially stressed in the mainstream since conformity to the behavioral demands of the regular classroom was considered to be the critical factor in a successful mainstream experience. If a student returned to the EH class with assignments from the regular teacher (including the completion of unfinished work), these academic requirements were fulfilled in the EH class where adult help could be provided when needed. Once the students demonstrated the ability to (behaviorally) function in the regular class, higher expectations for work completion in the mainstream were set by the EH teacher.

Objective four of this practicum has also been met. Teachers

scored and recorded each student's daily rating sheet and they conducted monthly analyses of the obtained data in order to assess student progress and program effectiveness. During the monthly evaluations such issues as reduction in behavioral objectives on the rating sheet, mainstreaming, and transition into a higher Level were addressed. Time-out frequencies were also recorded by the teachers and a pre intervention and end-of year time-out data comparison indicates a substantial decrease in the number of time-outs utilized by the three teachers (Table 4).

Table 4

Percentage of Time-Out Reduction In Self Contained EH Classes

EH 1	EH 2	EH 3
51	39	46

Interv. Period: 8 months

Objective five of this practicum could not be accomplished. In spite of the efforts made for achieving a high parent turn out for the monthly parenting sessions (e.g. babysitting services snacks, written monthly reminders, and phone calls the night before), only 20% of the parents were in attendance. It is noteworthy, however, that with the exception of a mother of

a single parent household, the monthly evening classes were attended by both the mothers and fathers of the EH students. In addition, one set of parents brought the student's grandmother to a session. The grandmother, who played a very dominant role in the child's family and appeared to sabotage the parents' newly acquired methods for managing their daughter, was brought to the parenting class "to hear the proper way of dealing with..." the EH student.

Teachers and parents reported significant behavioral gains made by those children whose parent(s) had participated in the monthly classes. Some positive changes were evidenced within the first month of the evening sessions, and continued progress was reported by both teachers and parents throughout the school year. During the parent sessions strong bonds were formed among the members, and some women called each other for support and management suggestions between meetings. All members (particularly the women) indicated that they were relieved to hear that other parents had similar difficulties with their children, and one mother tearfully related during the third session that this knowledge freed her of the guilt and shame which she had held within her for years.

Fathers, likewise, demonstrated changes in their behavior

and in their interactions with their EH child. One father, for example, who at the beginning of the parenting classes related with his children in a harsh and autocratic manner and who during the first two sessions prided himself for having his children respond to the snap of his fingers, ceased his finger snapping and cold, unyielding mannerism as time progressed. Toward the end of the school year, he was observed touching his sons when he sought their attention and in an apparent attempt to express affection. Mothers and fathers also reported that the newly assumed "united front" approach in the behavioral expectations and limit setting for their child proved effective not only in bringing about the desired behavioral changes in the student, but also in reducing the many disagreements they once had over their respective child rearing practices.

Objective six of this practicum was not met. Although significant positive behavioral changes in the EH children whose parent(s) attended the EH parent-training groups were reported by both the classroom teacher and the parent(s), pre and post parent-training comparison of the attendants' responses to the Parent Surveys and Questionnaires did not reflect the expected 50% increase in child management and parenting skills. These unexpected results are probably due to the fact that only a

small (and hence highly selected) group of EH parents attend the monthly parenting sessions. Pre parenting class responses to the Survey indicated, for example, that all parents attended some of their children's school social functions and school conferences. Most of the parents surveyed, also monitored their children's homework or homework assignments. It is quite probable that because of their active involvement with their children's activities, these parents were more willing and able to attend the parenting classes. Conversely, parent(s) who were spending less time attending school functions and conferences with teachers, also had little time or interest in attending the parenting classes.

Pre and post parent training Questionnaire results indicate that those parents who used ineffective management techniques (e.g. yelling, hitting) and/or who had unreasonable cognitive and emotional expectations of their children (i.e. that their child feel, act and think as they do) learned more appropriate child management skills and a better understanding of the developmental limitations of their children by having participated in the parenting classes. Objective six was not met as a higher than expected number of parents gave appropriate responses on the pre parent-training Questionnaire.

In summary, most objectives of this practicum have been met. Untrained EH teachers and their aides successfully implemented a behavioral level system for dealing with self contained EH elementary school children. These teachers carefully logged the EH students' daily behavioral charts and conducted periodic evaluations of the data gathered, to insure that each child's program needs continued to be appropriately met. The students enrolled in the three self contained EH units significantly reduced their maladaptive behaviors in the class room, and more than 50% of the students moved from the most restrictive Level 1 to a Level which empowered them to assume responsibility for appropriate behavior. Time out, likewise, was substantially reduced and most (except four) attended at least one regular (mainstream) class at the end of the school year. Finally, although a great deal of effort was placed on achieving at least a 50% enrollment in parent-training sessions, only 20% of the EH children's parents participated in these monthly sessions. This low attendance rate was unfortunate, as both the attending parents and the teachers reported significant positive changes in those children whose parents participated in parent training.

Notable differences in the degree to which each of the three classes was successful in achieving the targeted objectives are apparent. For example, students in EH 1 surpassed children

enrolled in EH 2 and EH 3 on virtually all objectives measured, and EH 3 students did slightly better than the students enrolled in EH 2 (Tables 1 through 4). These differences cannot be easily explained, but might be due to individual variability among the three teachers. Research conducted by the Minnesota State Department of Education (1985), for example, indicates that teachers' expectation expressed through feedback (affirmation, correction, praise, listening, etc.) can raise a student's level of performance, and Cooper (1986), Geoghan (1986), McCloskey and Lorence (1987), and Salend and Johns (1983) have demonstrated that teachers' attitudes, flexibility and skills in motivating students can be instrumental in modifying a child's academic and behavioral performance in school.

This practicum clearly was of value to both EH students and their teachers who had little experience in working with emotionally handicapped children in self contained units. Although this Level system and its many components was implemented at the elementary school level, it is very probable that similar results could be obtained if this program were used with an older EH population. Reinforcers may need to be slightly altered for age-appropriateness, and further research in this area will be needed.

Recommendations

1. This writer did not address the effects of teacher expectations and attitudes when in-servicing the teachers and aides. In view of the potential power of these variables, it is recommended that a segment of the training sessions be devoted to this subject, including the effects of such non-verbal cues as body language.

2. Enrollment in the parent training classes might be increased if they are made an integral part of the EH program and hence the expectation of attendance is communicated to the parent(s) at the time of staffing.

3. Because of its success rate among elementary school aged children, it is recommended that this program be implemented with junior high and high school EH students, with adjustments made for developmentally appropriate reinforcers.

Dissemination

1. Results of this practicum will be made available to the ESE department for possible adoption by all new, untrained EH teachers.

2. Major components of this present Level system will be adopted in the newly created self contained EH unit at the local junior high school to insure continuity in program for the EH students moving from the fifth to sixth grade. (Note: A self contained EH class does not exist at the local high school at the present time.)

3. A near-by center for Severely Emotionally Disturbed students has requested (and will receive) a copy of this practicum for possible implementation of this program.

4. Results of the Behavioral Level System and a copy of this practicum will be presented to this writer's department.

References

Buckalew, I. W., and Buckalew, P. B. (1983). Behavioral Management of Exceptional Children Using Video Games as Reward. Perceptual and Motor Skills. 56, 580.

Cooper, H. M. (1986). Chapter 1 Programs Reduce Student-To Instructor Ratios but Do Reduced Ratios Affect Achievement? Designs for Compensatory Education: Conference Proceedings and Papers. (Washington, D.C., June 17-18, 1986).

Edelbrock, C. (1983). Problems and Issues in Using Rating Scales to Asses Child Personality and Psychopathology. School Psychology Review, 12, (3), 293-298.

Ford, D., Evans, J. H., and Dworkin, L. K. (1982). Teaching Interaction Procedures: Effects upon the Learning of Social Skills by an Emotionally Disturbed Child. Education and Treatment of Children. 5, (1), 1-11.

Geoghan, T. (1986). Teaching Emotionally Handicapped Adolescents. Exceptional-Child. 33, (3), 110-113.

Goh, D. S. and Fuller, G. B. (1983). Current Practices in the Assessment of Personality and Behavior by School Psychologists. School Psychology Review, 12, (3), 240-243.

Kendall, P. C., and Finch, A. J. (1979). Analyses of Changes in Verbal Behavior following a Cognitive-Behavioral Treatment for Impulsivity. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology. 7, (4). 455-463.

Knoff, H. M. (1986). Identifying and Classifying Children and Adolescents Referred for Personality Assessment: Theories, Systems and Issues. In H. M. Knoff (Ed.), The Assessment of Child and Adolescent Personality (pp. 353-398). New York: Guilford.

Knoff, H. M. (1983). Justifying Projective/Personality Assessment in School Psychology: A Response to Batsche and Peterson. School Psychology Review, 12, (4), 446-451.

Lackar, D. and LaCombe, J. A. (1983). Objective Personality Assessment: The Personality Inventory for Children and its Application in the School Setting. School Psychology Review. 12 (4), 399-406.

McCloskey, M. and Quay, L. C. (1987). Effects of Coaching on Handicapped Children's Social Behavior and Teachers' Attitudes in Mainstreamed Classrooms. Elementary-School Journal. 87, (4), 425-436.

McDermott, P. A. (1983). A Syndromic Typology for Analyzing School Children's Disturbed Social Behavior. School Psychology Review. 12 (4), 250-259.

Meichenbaum, D. and Burland, S. (1979). Cognitive Behavior Modification with Children. School Psychology Digest, 8 (4), 426-431.

Minnesota State Department of Education, St. Paul (1985). School Effectiveness: Expectations.

Ostrander R. and Colegrove, R. (1988). Legislative Ambiguity and the Accurate Identification of Seriously Emotionally Disturbed. The Journal of School Psychology. 26, 77-85.

Pepper, F. C. and Roberson, M. D. (1983). The Integration of Adlerian and Behavioral Approaches in the Classroom Management of Emotionally Handicapped Children. Individual Psychology. 39 (1), 165-172.

Popeil, P. S., Hollinger, J. D., Loschi, G. A., and Crawford, D. R. (1983). A Sociometric Approach to Understanding Interpersonal Relationships in a Classroom for Emtionally Disturbed Pupils. The Pointer, 27 (3), 5-12.

Ritchie, M. H. (1986). The Influence of Referral Information on the Diagnostic Classification of Exceptional Children. The Exceptional Child. 33 (3), 181-186.

Salend, S. J., and Johns, J. (1983). A Tale of Two Teachers: Chaning Teacher Commitment to Mainstreaming. Teaching Exceptional-Children. 15, (2), 82-85.

Sattler, J. S. (1983). Identifying and Classifying Disturbed Children in the Schools: Implications of DSM-III for School Psychology. School Psychology Review. 12 (4), 384-390.

Shapiro, E. S., and Klein, R. D. (1980). Self-Management of Classroom Behavior with Retarded/Disturbed Children. Behavior Modification. 4 (1), 83-97.

Stotsky, B. A., Browne, T. H., and Lister, B. (1987). Differences among Emotionally Disturbed Children in Three Treatment and School Settings: Discriminant Function and Multiple Regression Analysis. Child Psychiatry and Human Development. 17 (4), 235-241.

Swanson, H. L. (1985). Effects of Cognitive-Behavioral Training on Emotionally Disturbed Children's Academic Performance. Cognitive Therapy and Research. 9 (2), 201-216.

Tharinger, D. J., Laurent, J., and Best, L. R. (1986). Classification of Children Referred for Emotional and Behavioral Problems: A Comparison of PL 94-142 SED Criteria, DSM III, and the CBL System. Journal of School Psychology, 24, 111-121.

Walker, H. M., Hops, H., and Fiegenbaum, E. (1976). Deviant Classroom Behavior as a Function of Combinations of Social and Token Reinforcement and Cost Contingency. Behavior Therapy, 7, 76-88.

APPENDIX A

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Please circle the appropriate answer or write your response in the provided space.

1. How do you discipline your child?_____

2. On the average, how many times must you tell your child to do something before he/she does it?_____

3. Because of my child's behavior, we have more bad than good times together. Y N

4. When I am stressed or I don't feel well, I expect my child to behave better than usual. Y N

5. My child does things just to spite me.
   Always Sometimes Never

6. If my child really cared for me she/he would behave better. Y N

7. I don't know what makes my child do the things he/she does. Y N

8. If my child wanted to, her/his behavior could be much better. Y N

9. My child inherited some of his/her behaviors from his mother/father. Y N

10. Spankings work best with children. Y N

APPENDIX B

PARENT SURVEY

PARENT SURVEY

Homemaker
Employed (time) from____ to_
Number of Adults in your home ____
Number of Children in your home _____

Please circle the appropriate answer or write your response in the blank space.

1. On a school day, how many hours of TV does your child watch?_____

2. How many hours is your child in the care of another adult?_____

3. Do you attend some of your child's school social functions? (e.g. birthday party, play) Y N

4. If you circled Yes (in #3), what functions have you attended?_____

5. Does your child require your help with school work? Y N

6. How much time do you have to do things with your child?
   Weedends_____
   Weekdays_____

7. Besides yourself, who is your child's most favorite adult?_____

8. Do you check your child's home work? Y N

9. How many school conferences or meetings have you attended last school year?_____

10. What activities do you engage in with your child?

_____

APPENDIX C

RATING SHEET
LEVEL 1

Name_____ Date_____

	PERIOD I			II			III			LUNCH			IV			V			VI		
	G	S	U	G	S	U	G	S	U	G	S	U	G	S	U	G	S	U	G	S	U
Obeys Room Rules																					
Uses Proper Language																					
Follows Directions																					
Stays in Seat																					
Works Appropriately										X	X	X									
Child Specific Goal																					

TOTAL_____ COMMENT:

Parent Signature_____